

i;o COMMENTARY ON MACAULAY'S HISTORY
 he cannot fairly be held responsible for faults
 which his
 colleagues should have corrected. During the
 winter he
 endeavoured to remedy some of them, but
 without success.
 According to Burnet, ' he tried to dictate to
 the Board ;
 and, when he found that did not pass upon
 them, he left
 it : and studied all he could to disparage
 their conduct ;
 and it was thought he hoped to have been
 advanced to that
 high trust alone.'¹ He was opposed not only by
 his five
 colleagues, none of whom had any naval
 experience, but
 also by the principal Secretary of State, the
 Earl of Nottingham. When he urged many reasons for
 strengthening
 the fleet, Nottingham only answered, ' You will
 be strong
 enough for the French/ ' My Lord/ replied
 Torrington,
 ' I know my business, and will do my best
 with what I
 have ; but pray remember it is not my fault
 that the fleet
 is no stronger. I own I am afraid now, in
 winter, whilst
 the danger may be remedied ; and you will be
 afraid in
 summer, when it is past remedy/² From these
 facts it is
 obvious that when Macaulay censures
 Torrington for the
 inefficiency of the fleet, he is unjust. On
 Torrington's
 resignation, Thomas, Earl of Pembroke, was
 made First
 Lord, but three out of the five old
 commissioners remained
 in office till March 1692. Why Pembroke was
 appointed
 is not clear. Burnet describes him as

a man of eminent virtue, and of great and
profound
learning, particularly in the mathematics :
this made him
a little too speculative and abstracted in his
notions : he
had great application, but he lived a little too
much out of
the world, though in a public station ; a little
more prac-
tice among men would give him the last
finishing : there
was something in his person and manner that
created him

¹ Bumet, Own Time, ii. 5.

² P. H. Colomb, Naval Warfare (1891), p, 112.